DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 384 SP 006 347

TITLE	An Evaluation of School Personnel Utilization Projects. Volume III, An Assessment of the Impact of School Personnel Utilization Program Training.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Dept. of Educational Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	83p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Differentiated Staffs; Evaluation; *Manpower Utilization; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *School Personnel; *Staff Utilization

ABSTRACT

Volume III of the evaluation of the School Personnel Program (SPU), designed by Florida State University, assesses the impact of program training. Part I reports the extent to which school personnel trained in SPU projects were able to identify a "flexible staffing" approach and to view the flexible staffing approach as a desirable alternative to conventional staffing patterns. Part II describes the alternative staffing approaches being developed in terms of the goals of specific staffing projects, the priorities placed on various goals, and the degree to which the planning and implementation of high priority goals has taken place. The results of this "impact" assessment were returned to each individual project in the hope that this feedback would assist the projects in reaching their program goals. Appendixes of related material are included. (Related documents are SP 006 345 and SP 006 346.) (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 075384

VOLUME III

An Assessment of the Impact of School Personnel Utilization Program Training

The Evaluation Training Center
The Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida
1971

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 005 347

The work presented or reported herein was performed
pursuant to a grant from the
U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Table of Contents

	Page
Volume III: An Assessment of the Impact of the School Personnel Utilization Program Training	
Part 1. Assessment of the Perception and Desirability of Alternative Staffing Patterns	1
Introduction	1
Method	2
Respondents	2
Instruments	2
Data Collection	4
Analysis	5
Results	6
Form 01 - Perception of the Goals of SPU	6
Individualism	7
Collegiality	8
Workflow Structures	10
Perpetuation Structures	13
Systems Self-Renewal	16
Accountability	17
Conclusion	20
Form 02 - Receptivity to the Goals of SPU	21
Individualism	21
Collegiality	22
Workflow Structures	25
Perpetuation Structures	28
Systems Self-Renewal	31
Accountability	32
Conclusion	34
Interrelationships of Forms 01 and 02	35
Part 2. Status Study on Project Goals, Goal Priorities, and Goal Implementation	40
Introduction	40
Method	40
Results	44
The Ranking of Goal Statements	44
The Development of an Importance/Implementation Matrix	57
References	63
Appendix	64

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF THE SCHOOL PERSONNEL UTILIZATION PROGRAM

One objective of the School Personnel Utilization (SPU) program is to train the personnel of project schools to develop alternative patterns of school personnel utilization (i.e., "flexible staffing") which will result in more effective teaching and learning environments. Thus, SPU projects were expected, through training and orientation, to enable their school personnel to design and implement alternative staffing patterns. Part 1 of this volume reports the extent to which school personnel trained in SPU projects were able to identify a "flexible staffing" approach to staffing problems, and to view the flexible staffing approach as a desirable alternative to conventional staffing patterns. Part 2 of this volume describes the alternative staffing approaches being developed in terms of the goals of specific staffing projects, the priorities placed on various goals, and the degree to which the planning and implementation of high priority goals has taken place. The results of this "impact" assessment were returned to each individual project in the hope that this feedback would assist the projects in reaching their program goals.

Part 1

Assessment of the Perception and Desirability of Alternative Staffing Patterns

Introduction

As one phase of the evaluation program for School Personnel Utilization (SPU), an assessment was conducted on the impact of the SPU program on project schools. This phase of the evaluation focused upon the perceptions, attitudes, and receptivity of school personnel toward selected principles of staff utilization. Because of the effort directed toward the dissemination of flexible-staffing principles among individuals within the funded SPU projects, information concerning perceptions of flexible staffing seemed particularly relevant. Information relating to attitudes toward these principles seemed especially important since successful implementation of flexible staffing models relies to a great extent upon the receptive attitudes of the personnel.

The failure of educational innovations shortly after the initial implementation can often be attributed to a misunderstanding of the concepts underlying the innovations, or to participants in the program who are not receptive to the new ideas. It was hoped that feedback of the results of this evaluation, at the local level as well as to the USOE level, would help clarify such areas of misunderstanding in the early stages of implementation. An implicit assumption in the successful implementation of flexible staffing models is a clear understanding of the concepts underlying SPU as well as receptivity of all levels of project personnel toward these concepts.

Two instruments were developed to assess the perception of and receptivity toward flexible staffing concepts. The first form (Form 01)

was developed to determine the effects of training and/or involvement upon the ability of participants to discriminate between the characteristics of flexible and traditional patterns of staffing. The second form (Form 02) was developed to measure willingness to participate in a school with characteristics of flexible staffing. Forms 01 and 02 are reproduced in full in Appendix 3.

Method

Respondents

All federally-funded SPU projects were requested to participate in the survey. Project administrators received explicit instructions for distributing Forms 01 and 02 on a random basis to their personnel. Each respondent was asked to identify himself on a number of variables: (a) project, (b) position in the educational system, (c) school level, (d) sex, and (e) years of experience. Several schools which were not implementing SPU programs were included in the survey to serve as controls. For both Forms 01 and 02 the distributions of respondents according to affiliation with control or experimental schools and position in the school system are given in Table 1.

Instruments

The final forms of the instruments were preceded by several forms which were subjected to formative evaluation. The first version was evaluated by individual staff members of the Evaluation Training Center. Following revisions based on their comments, several members of the ETC staff met with evaluators from the individual SPU projects at the Leadership Training Institute (LTI) Conference held in Colorado on

TABLE 1

Distribution by Position of
Respondents to Forms 01 and 02

Position in the School System	Form 01		Form 02	
	Experimental Schools	Control Schools	Experimental Schools	Control Schools
District Administrative Staff	31	0	27	0
Local Administrative Staff	74	5	66	0
Faculty	655	44	566	44
Non-Teaching Personnel	112	1	141	4
Consultants	3	0	8	0
Others	47	4	133	14
Parents	0	0	98	0
Total	922	54	1039	62

October 18-22. The ETC staff administered draft versions of the prototype 01 and 02 instruments to the project evaluators who provided comments which were helpful in producing the final versions of the instruments.

Forms 01 and 02 are identical except for the instructions which precede the items. In both forms the first twelve items request the classification information mentioned in the preceding section. These questions are followed by brief instructions which explain the purpose of the instrument and direct the respondent to answer the 31 scaling items. All responses were made on an IBM answer sheet. The instructions also include a phrase which establishes a different response set

for each form. The instructions of Form 01 include the following phrase:

> I personally perceive Flexible Staffing to be a school organization in which:

The analogous part of Form 02 is stated as follows:

> I would like to be a participant (teacher, administrator, parent, etc.) in a school in which:

These phrases are followed by the same 31 items which were to be evaluated on a five-point, agree-disagree scale. An example of an item of Form 01 is given below:

I personally perceive Flexible Staffing to be a school organization in which:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13. individual teachers do their own jobs independently of other members of the staff.	0	1	2	3	4

Twenty-one of the items depict characteristics of flexible staffing; ten of the items depict traditional staffing patterns and practices.

When reference is made to an item, an asterisk precedes the number of those items which represents traditional staffing patterns and practices.

Data Collection

Procedures for administering the instruments were discussed and revised at the LTI in Colorado. Survey forms and answer sheets were later sent to administrative personnel of all federally-funded SPU projects with explicit instructions for their administration. Essentially, the instructions requested that members of the project staffs

be randomly assigned either Form 01 or Form 02. Approximately equal numbers of both forms were distributed and returned.

Analysis

The data of Forms 01 and 02 were processed and tabulated by personnel at ETC and returned to respective project personnel with detailed interpretations. These reports have not been included in this paper since their purpose was to provide specific information about each project staff, and was to be used in the project's internal formative evaluation. The results presented in this report compile and summarize the responses of all projects without identifying specific projects.

For this summary, the data were transformed from the original five response format (Strongly Agree, Agree, Uncertain, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) to three categories--agree, uncertain, and disagree. The percentages of responses for each item were tabulated for the two categories of: 1) control and experimental groups, and 2) position of the respondent in the school system classifications. Chi-square analyses of frequencies were then performed to determine if variations in response patterns among the different classifications were greater than that one might reasonably expect from chance. The chi-square analyses were performed on contingency tables of: (a) item response (agree, undecided, disagree) for control and experimental groups, (b) item response versus school position, and (c) Form 01 item responses versus Form 02 responses. This last analysis was performed separately for administrators in the experimental group and teachers in the experimental group.

The control/experimental chi-square analyses for item responses form 2 x 3 contingency tables with two degrees of freedom. The chi-square value needed to reject the null hypothesis that no statistical association exists between the control and experimental groups in the way their members respond to an item is 9.21($p < .01$).

The chi-square value for rejecting the null hypothesis relating to school position versus item response is 16.81 for Form 01 (4 x 3 contingency table, 6 degrees of freedom, $p < .01$) and 20.09 for Form 02 (5 x 3 contingency table, 8 degrees of freedom, $p < .01$). Rejection of this hypothesis for an item will indicate that response to the item is related to group membership and that frequencies for each position should be examined. Otherwise there is no statistical association between school position and item response and the total percentage can justifiably be considered representative of the total group's reaction to the item.

The chi-square value for rejecting the null hypothesis that there is no difference between receptivity and perception, Forms 01 and 02, for an item is 9.21 (2 x 3 contingency table, 2 degrees of freedom, $p < .01$).

RESULTS

Form 01 - Perception of the Goals of SPU.

The 31 items were separated into six groups of items to facilitate the discussion of the results. These groups represent six major dimensions of the conceptual model of staff use proposed by DeBloois (1970) and are titled as follows:

1. Individualism
2. Collegiality
3. Workflow Structures
4. Perpetuation Structures
5. Systems Self Renewal
6. Accountability

To describe the results for the six groups, the following pattern of presentation is used. First, the questionnaire items of each category are reproduced with the "traditional" items marked by an asterisk. Second, the percentage of respondents choosing each response category (agree, disagree, uncertain) and the chi-square values are shown. The percentages shown are for the combined experimental and control groups. Where the percentages for these groups differ significantly, the separate percentages are usually given in the text. Third, the significant results are discussed.

Individualism. The following two items are included in the category representing individualism.

11. teachers are encouraged to attain their own career goals within the instructional staff even though the goals of different teachers may vary widely

12. a teacher who is adept at working with small groups may spend most of his time doing so

From the results presented in Table 2, the chi-square analysis demonstrates that the responses of the control and experimental groups were quite similar, but that the differences according to school position were more marked. Administrators and faculty members, as opposed to non-teaching personnel and others, were in greater agreement that, within flexible staffing, teachers are encouraged to seek their own career goals and could work in a capacity most suited to their talents. The high percentage of agreement by nearly all groups of respondents

TABLE 2

Individualism

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
11	Administrators	79.6	13.9	6.5		
	Faculty	80.1	12.5	7.4		
	Non-teaching	68.2	26.4	5.5	0.47	15.74
	Others	74.1	18.5	7.4	(2df)	(6df)
	Total	78.5	14.5	7.1		
12	Administrators	84.3	4.6	11.1		
	Faculty	72.4	9.6	18.0		
	Non-teaching	59.1	14.5	26.4	0.76	21.55*
	Others	67.3	18.2	14.5		
	Total	71.9	10.1	18.0		

*$p < .01$

to these items indicates that the concepts of flexible staffing which relate to individualism were correctly perceived by many participants.

Collegiality. The area of collegiality is represented by the following five items:

** 1. individual teachers do their own jobs independently of other members of the staff

2. informality is evident in instructional and administrative intercommunications

3. instructional problems are solved through a group process involving teachers

4. teachers interact with administrators in group meetings as equals even though their responsibilities differ in type and amount

30. teachers usually approach faculty meetings with a sense of responsibility for helping solve school problems

Summary statistics for these items are presented in Table 3. Various positions within the school apparently perceive most of these items

** These items represent traditional staffing.

TABLE 3

Collegiality

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
**1	Administrators	4.6	2.8	92.6		
	Faculty	11.9	5.3	82.8		
	Non-teaching	14.5	10.0	75.5	0.35	17.32*
	Others	16.7	0.0	83.3	(2df)	(6df)
	Total	11.6	5.3	83.1		
2	Administrators	67.3	12.1	20.6		
	Faculty	64.1	16.6	19.2		
	Non-teaching	76.8	10.7	12.5	7.93	8.78
	Others	71.7	13.2	15.1		
	Total	66.4	15.3	18.4		
3	Administrators	90.7	5.6	3.7		
	Faculty	84.9	7.9	7.2		
	Non-teaching	85.7	5.4	8.9	1.40	5.28
	Others	83.6	5.5	10.9		
	Total	85.6	7.2	7.2		
4	Administrators	80.4	11.2	8.4		
	Faculty	76.3	11.2	12.5		
	Non-teaching	73.2	19.6	7.1	11.89*	12.35
	Others	67.3	20.0	12.7		
	Total	75.9	12.7	11.4		
30	Administrators	84.1	5.6	10.3		
	Faculty	78.6	10.2	11.2		
	Non-teaching	85.7	9.8	4.5	1.42	7.83
	Others	83.6	9.1	7.3		
	Total	80.3	9.6	10.1		

**=Traditional Item

*p<.01

similarly. There is a significant difference among responses classified according to school position for the traditionally oriented statement that teachers do their jobs independently. The administrators revealed the best understanding of this concept (i.e., 92.6%), yet at least 75% of the other respondent groups disagreed also.

The two items of this group (3 and 30) which deal with problem-solving strategies resulted in greater than 75% agreement in all groups. The flexible staffing concepts of including teachers in group problem-solving practices seems to have been well understood. Less well understood were the concepts (2 and 4) relating to faculty and administrative interaction. Only 66% of the respondents agreed that informality should be evident in communications between instructional and administrative personnel. Upon closer examination, it appears that administrators and faculty groups were in less agreement about this concept than were the other two groups. The experimental and control groups differed significantly in their response to the concept of administrators and faculty interacting as equals (#4). Only 57% of the control as a whole agreed with the statement whereas 77% of the experimental group agreed. This implies that the control group has retained a more traditional concept of faculty-administrative interaction. The responses in the agree column for this item would be several percentage points higher than for the experimental group alone. It is interesting to note that only 66% of the respondents agreed that informality is acceptable in intercommunication between administrators and instructional personnel yet 76% agreed that persons in these positions may interact as equals. Perhaps the faculty and administrators see a need for formalizing some forms of intercommunication.

Workflow structures. The following nine items are included within the category of workflow structures:

9. teachers interview, individually or collectively, applicants for instructional positions--and their response usually determines whether or not the applicant is hired.

*25. each teacher prepares his yearly curriculum outline on his own.

28. the individual teacher exercises considerable autonomy in selecting the topics which he will include in the courses which he teaches.

*5. the administration assumes responsibility for planning the instructional program, and the teachers devote their attention to its implementation.

*13. it is assumed that the typical teacher prefers to be directed and therefore must be closely supervised in order to achieve school objectives.

15. the method used for solving problems is based on the assumption that ingenuity and creativity are widely distributed among school personnel.

*16. there are detailed written policies regulating teacher behavior.

17. teachers who do not wish to carry a full workload are employed as instructional personnel on a part-time basis.

18. the instructional staff may decide to purchase $8,000 worth of self-instructional materials instead of filling an authorized teaching position.

From the results summarized in Table 4, it can be concluded that the experimental and control groups responded similarly to all nine items. However, there were significant differences on four items (5, 25, 17, and 18) among responses of the different position groups. These items related to differentiation of responsibilities, teacher authority, part-time employment of instructional personnel, and purchase of equipment as an alternative to filling an authorized position. The administrators' responses revealed the best understanding of the concepts and the non-teaching personnel, the least. The range of responses in the expected direction was from 25% to 93%.

On item number 25, 70% of the respondents disagreed that the teacher should prepare his own yearly curriculum. This response was consistent with the expectations for that particular item. In contrast to this,

TABLE 4

Workflow Structures

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
**5	Administrators	5.6	2.8	91.7		
	Faculty	8.8	7.0	84.2		
	Non-teaching	14.3	18.8	67.0	0.51	34.97*
	Other	16.4	3.6	80.0	(2df)	(6df)
	Total	9.5	7.7	82.8		
9	Administrators	60.2	25.0	14.8		
	Faculty	54.7	20.3	24.9		
	Non-teaching	47.3	19.6	33.0	8.88	10.54
	Others	58.2	18.2	23.6		
	Total	54.7	20.7	24.7		
**25	Administrators	11.1	10.2	78.7		
	Faculty	19.3	12.6	68.1		
	Non-teaching	14.4	29.7	55.9	0.31	33.97*
	Others	29.1	14.5	56.4		
	Total	18.4	14.4	67.2		
**28	Administrators	56.5	11.1	32.4		
	Faculty	63.4	15.8	20.8		
	Non-teaching	50.9	21.4	27.7	3.53	15.20
	Others	63.0	9.3	27.8		
	Total	61.1	15.6	23.3		
**13	Administrators	2.8	5.6	91.6		
	Faculty	4.6	5.2	90.2		
	Non-teaching	5.4	6.3	88.4	0.42	1.30
	Others	5.6	5.6	88.9		
	Total	4.5	5.4	90.1		
15	Administrators	84.3	6.5	9.3		
	Faculty	74.4	14.6	11.1		
	Non-teaching	73.0	16.2	10.8	6.22	7.10
	Others	76.4	10.9	12.7		
	Total	75.4	13.6	11.0		
**16	Administrators	25.0	14.8	60.2		
	Faculty	23.6	18.4	58.0		
	Non-teaching	32.4	19.8	47.7	4.00	6.67
	Others	27.3	21.8	50.9		
	Total	25.0	18.4	56.7		
17	Administrators	66.7	8.3	25.0		
	Faculty	61.6	20.4	18.0		
	Non-teaching	46.8	28.8	24.3	4.77	20.16*
	Others	63.6	20.0	16.4		
	Total	60.6	20.0	19.4		
18	Administrators	61.1	12.0	26.9		
	Faculty	46.4	25.6	27.9		
	Non-teaching	23.4	36.0	40.5	5.67	40.60*
	Others	32.7	25.5	41.8		
	Total	44.7	25.3	30.0		

**=Traditional Item

*$p < .01$

the majority of the respondents reacted to item 28, relating to teacher autonomy in selecting course topics, in the wrong direction. Sixty-one percent indicated that teacher autonomy was an underlying concept of flexible staffing. This result seems contradictory to the conclusion, based on items 5 and 25, that curriculum design is a group effort. Agreement with the concept of autonomous selection of course topics, yet disagreement with the concept of individual preparation of a yearly curriculum may indicate that teachers are willing to have others do the planning as long as they can do as they choose in their own classrooms.

The item relating to hiring teacher applicants revealed the greatest misunderstanding. Only about 55% of the respondents agreed that teachers have so crucial a role in hiring prospective colleagues that their response generally determines whether an applicant is hired. Ninety percent of the respondents disagreed with the statement that teachers need and want to be closely supervised. Seventy-five percent agreed that ingenuity and creativity are widely distributed among school personnel, but only 57% disagreed that flexible staffing embodies specification of detailed written policies regulating teacher behavior.

Four of the nine items (#9, 16, 17 and 18) in this grouping revealed misunderstanding of concepts of workflow structures in flexible staffing by a large percentage of respondents. The only item that revealed understanding by 90% of the respondents dealt with the desirability of close supervision of teachers, which might be considered uncharacteristic of the practice of traditional staffing as well.

Perpetuation structures. The eight items listed below compose the category of perpetuation structures:

6. teachers who have demonstrated exceptional skill and expertise as instructors receive instructional responsibilities and salaries considerably above that of other teachers.

**7. the opportunity exists for a teacher to serve half-time as an administrator and half-time as an instructor.

**10. teachers, with few exceptions, have duties and responsibilities which are different only in regard to subject area or grade level.

14. there is a deliberate attempt to recruit teachers whose special interests and abilities are consistent with school objectives.

19. teachers are employed on the basis of their interests and special abilities as well as on their certification status.

20. teachers are provided in-service training opportunities leading to increased instructional responsibility and increased pay.

21. paraprofessionals and other non-certified personnel are used in the classroom as instructional assistants.

22. promotions and advancements are based on evaluations of teachers' performance by subordinates, peers, superiors, and students.

The responses to these items are summarized in Table 5. The experimental and control schools responded similarly on all but item #7. Fifty-one percent of those respondents classified as experimental agreed that the opportunity for a teacher to serve half-time as an administrator was typical of flexible staffing, whereas only 30% of those classified as control agreed. Since this was one of the items characteristic of traditional staffing patterns, it appears that information dissemination on this aspect of flexible staffing may have been misleading. The percentages in the disagree column for this item would be several percentage points lower if the control schools were removed.

Significant differences were found in responses according to school position on the items (6, 10, 20, and 22) relating to promotion of

**These items represent traditional staffing

TABLE 5

Perpetuation Structures

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
6	Administrators	73.8	15.0	11.2		
	Faculty	47.0	23.7	29.3		
	Non-teaching	33.3	28.8	37.8	4.67	40.18*
	Others	49.1	27.3	23.6	(2df)	(6df)
	Total	48.5	23.5	28.0		
**7	Administrators	48.1	20.4	31.5		
	Faculty	50.7	21.2	28.1		
	Non-teaching	38.7	26.1	35.1	13.03*	8.82
	Others	61.1	16.7	22.2		
	Total	49.6	21.4	28.9		
**10	Administrators	29.6	9.3	61.1		
	Faculty	32.9	17.3	49.8		
	Non-teaching	55.6	15.7	28.7	4.34	32.04*
	Others	40.7	11.1	48.1		
	Total	35.5	15.9	48.6		
14	Administrators	83.3	8.3	8.3		
	Faculty	69.8	17.6	12.6		
	Non-teaching	62.5	23.2	14.3	7.59	14.11
	Others	65.5	23.6	10.9		
	Total	70.2	17.6	12.2		
19	Administrators	92.6	3.7	3.7		
	Faculty	87.4	6.2	6.5		
	Non-teaching	84.8	12.5	2.7	0.49	11.85
	Others	87.3	9.1	3.6		
	Total	87.7	6.8	5.6		
20	Administrators	89.8	2.8	7.4		
	Faculty	82.4	9.5	8.2		
	Non-teaching	75.7	19.8	4.5	5.00	20.80*
	Others	87.3	7.3	5.5		
	Total	82.7	9.8	7.5		
21	Administrators	94.4	2.8	2.8		
	Faculty	85.9	5.2	8.9		
	Non-teaching	89.2	5.5	6.3	8.22	11.75
	Others	94.5		0.0		
	Total	87.7	4.8	7.4		
22	Administrators	73.1	10.2	16.7		
	Faculty	54.2	21.9	23.9		
	Non-teaching	53.2	29.7	17.1	0.29	21.86*
	Others	65.5	18.2	16.4		
	Total	56.8	21.3	21.9		

**=Traditional Item

*p<.01

teachers who demonstrate exceptional skill and expertise; differentiated responsibilities; in-service training opportunities; and methods of promotion based on evaluations by subordinates, peers, superiors, and students. More of the administrators (70%) responded in the expected direction than did those in other groups. This difference is quite marked for item #10 relating to teacher specialization beyond subject matter or grade level, and item #6 concerning teacher expertise. Except for administrators, the level of agreement was relatively low for these items and for item #22 dealing with promotion. Perception of the item relating to in-service training (item #20) seems more accurate than that of the three items just mentioned, since at least 75% of the respondents in each group correctly perceived it as representative of flexible staffing. Of the three remaining items (14, 19, and 21) 70% agreed that teachers who have abilities and interests which are consistent with school objectives are recruited, yet nearly 88% agreed that teachers are hired on the basis of their interests and abilities as well as their certification status. Eighty-eight percent also agreed that the use of non-certified personnel in the classroom is a characteristic of flexible staffing patterns.

Systems self-renewal. The following two items relate to systems self-renewal:

*8. teachers generally feel that universities, demonstration schools, and research centers are set up for developing and testing new educational theories; this is not a part of the classroom role.

26. teachers' instructional activities are determined by written instructional goals.

The response summaries of these items are presented in Table 6. Significant differences between experimental and control respondents were

TABLE 6

Systems Self-Renewal

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
**8	Administrators	12.0	10.2	77.8		
	Faculty	11.7	14.2	74.1		
	Non-teaching	15.2	35.7	49.1	3.76	42.24*
	Other	18.2	18.2	63.6		
	Total	12.5	16.4	71.0		
**26	Administrators	75.9	14.8	9.3		
	Faculty	59.2	17.3	23.5		
	Non-teaching	53.2	29.7	17.1	9.80*	29.36*
	Other	45.5	29.1	25.5		
	Total	59.6	19.1	21.3		

**=Traditional Item

*$p < .01$

found for item number 26, the flexible staffing concept in the category. Sixty percent of the experimental group agreed with this item whereas only 44% of the control group agreed.

Both of the items, revealed significant differences among school position classifications. Respondents in the administration category showed the strongest response in the predicted direction for these items. Approximately 80% disagreed that concepts of flexible staffing oppose developing and testing educational theories in the normal classroom, and 76% agreed that teachers' instructional activities would be determined by written goals.

Accountability. Five items, listed below, are included in the category relating to accountability.

23. the school periodically explains to parents and to the public in general the objectives of the school and the extent to which they are met.

**24. much of the teachers' time is spent in instructional activities which cannot be evaluated in terms of student behavior.

27. pupils' achievement is a factor used in evaluating teachers' performance.

29. budgetary appropriations are related to educational objectives.

31. the school periodically asks parents and the public for their opinions about school policy and objectives.

Results of the responses to these items are summarized in Table 7. There were no significant differences for either of the two types of

TABLE 7

Accountability

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
23	Administrators	93.5	6.5	0.0		
	Faculty	90.0	6.2	3.9		
	Non-teaching	92.0	3.6	4.5	3.94	7.99
	Others	94.5	5.5	0.0	(2df)	(6df)
	Total	90.8	5.9	3.3		
**24	Administrators	17.6	14.8	67.6		
	Faculty	31.0	21.3	47.7		
	Non-teaching	30.6	24.3	45.0	1.11	27.74*
	Others	47.3	25.5	27.3		
	Total	30.4	21.2	48.5		
27	Administrators	66.7	15.7	17.6		
	Faculty	47.6	21.1	31.3		
	Non-teaching	58.9	17.9	23.2	9.39*	22.59*
	Others	61.8	23.6	14.5		
	Total	51.8	20.3	27.9		
29	Administrators	86.1	9.3	4.6		
	Faculty	68.7	18.8	12.5		
	Non-teaching	60.4	27.0	12.6	4.50	21.57*
	Others	72.7	12.7	14.5		
	Total	69.9	18.3	11.7		
31	Administrators	86.1	7.4	6.5		
	Faculty	74.7	13.7	11.7		
	Non-teaching	82.0	10.8	7.2	3.28	15.05
	Others	90.9	5.5	3.6		
	Total	77.7	12.2	10.1		

**=Traditional Item

*p<.01

respondent classifications for those two items (23 and 31) relating to the role of the public. Ninety-one percent of the respondents agreed that asking the public their opinions about school policy is a part of flexible staffing.

The experimental and control groups differed significantly in their response to item 27 relating to pupil achievement in evaluating teachers' performance. The experimental subjects were in greater agreement (53%) with this item than the controls (33%). Their percentages reported in the agree column would be several percentage points higher if controls were omitted. Both this item and the other item (24) relating to evaluation revealed significant differences among responses classified according to school positions. On item 24, which suggests student achievement should have no bearing on the evaluation of teachers, 60% of the administrative responses were in disagreement and only 48% of the faculty disagreed. Forty-eight of those respondents classified as "others" agreed with the concept item. The administrators revealed the greatest understanding of the concepts. However, none of the percentages in any respondent category exceeded 70% in the expected direction and most were around 50%. It appears that only about half the respondents correctly perceive flexible staffing to embody pupils' achievement as a factor in evaluating teachers' performance and traditional staffing to include teacher activities which have no effect on student behavior.

Eighty-six percent of the administrators agreed that budgetary appropriations are related to educational objectives in flexible staffing. Only about 70% of the other groups agreed with this concept. Since the faculty and other groups in flexible staffing share the decision-making

responsibility, it would seem that all groups should be aware of such a basic concept as was expressed in this item.

Conclusion. In comparison with the control subjects, the experimental subjects more frequently responded in a manner consistent with the principles of flexible staffing on 27 of 31 items, although only four of the thirty-one chi-square tests were significant at the .01 level. Since the control subjects were selected by administrators of SPU programs and were employed in school districts where SPU models were being implemented, it is not surprising that the control groups were also quite knowledgeable about concepts of flexible staffing. It is especially interesting to note that discrimination between these two groups was possible only on the concepts summarized below.

(1) Teachers and administrators interact as equals.
(2) Teachers also serve part-time as administrators.
(3) Teachers' instructional activities are determined by written goals.
(4) Pupils' achievement is a factor in evaluating teacher performance.

Differences in responses were statistically significant for 15 of the 31 items when subjects were classified according to school position. These items were spread out widely among the different categories. However, they related primarily to duties of teachers, evaluation of teachers, design of instruction, and the role of the public. There was greater agreement among groups on the items relating to the supervision of teachers, interaction of teachers and administrators, employment practices, problem solving strategies, and budget. This is an interesting trend which seems to indicate that members of the different groups are in greater agreement on some issues than others.

In viewing the items as a whole, the administrators gave the highest consensus response in the expected direction and the non-teaching personnel seemed the most uncertain. Overall, most of the responses were in the intended direction and above the 50% level. However, two items were answered in the wrong direction. That is, more respondents agreed than disagreed that teachers serving simultaneously as instructor and administrator and teachers autonomously selecting their course topics were representative of flexible staffing. These items were intended to represent traditional practice.

Form 02 - Receptivity to the Goals of SPU.

The percentages of responses for each school position and the results of the chi-square analysis for Form 02 are presented on the following pages. The format followed for the presentation of these results is identical to that used for Form 01, except that parental responses are included in the results.

Individualism. The two items listed below represent the individualism category.

11. teachers are encouraged to attain their own career goals within the instructional staff even though the goals of different teachers may vary widely.

12. a teacher who is adept at working with small groups may spend most of his time doing so.

The summarized responses to these items are presented in Table 8. The experimental and control groups differed significantly in the proportion of respondents who indicated that they would like to be a participant in a school where a teacher could spend most of his time working with small groups. Seventy-one percent of the experimental subjects were

TABLE 8

Individualism

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
11	Administrators	83.9	8.6	7.5		
	Faculty	79.0	14.9	6.1		
	Non-teaching	76.4	15.7	7.9	8.34 (2df)	4.99 (8df)
	Others	75.2	17.9	6.9		
	Parents	77.1	16.7	6.3		
	Total	78.4	15.1	6.6		
12	Administrators	76.3	6.5	17.2		
	Faculty	71.9	11.3	16.9		
	Non-teaching	59.9	19.0	21.1	12.06*	19.49
	Others	72.1	15.6	12.2		
	Parents	70.1	18.6	11.3		
	Total	70.5	13.1	16.3		

*$p < .01$

in favor of this, whereas only 58% of the controls agreed. The proportions in the agree column for this item would be several percentage points higher if the controls were omitted. Of the total group of respondents, more than 70% agreed that they would like to participate in a system where a teacher could spend most of his time working with small groups. Furthermore, 78% agreed that they would like to participate in a school where teachers are encouraged to attain their career goals even though the goals of different teachers might differ widely.

Collegiality. The five items listed below compose the collegiality category.

*1. individual teachers do their own jobs independently of other members of the staff.

2. informality is evident in instructional and administrative inter-communications.

3. instructional problems are solved through a group process involving teachers.

4. teachers interact with administrators in group meetings as equals even though their responsibilities differ in type and amount.

30. teachers usually approach faculty meetings with a sense of responsibility for helping solve school problems.

A summary of the responses for these five items is reported in Table 9. Experimental and control groups differed significantly in

TABLE 9

Collegiality

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
**1	Administrators	16.1	4.3	79.6		
	Faculty	16.5	9.1	74.4		
	Non-teaching	20.6	13.5	66.0	10.52* (2df)	15.63 (8df)
	Others	22.6	7.5	69.9		
	Parents	27.1	7.3	65.6		
	Total	18.8	8.9	72.4		
2	Administrators	76.3	12.9	10.8		
	Faculty	70.6	14.3	15.1		
	Non-Teaching	63.9	17.4	18.8	2.43	17.19
	Others	69.6	11.5	18.9		
	Parents	56.4	14.9	28.7		
	Total	68.8	14.3	16.9		
3	Administrators	88.0	3.3	8.7		
	Faculty	87.6	7.2	5.1		
	Non-teaching	83.3	9.0	7.6	2.00	7.73
	Others	89.0	7.5	3.4		
	Parents	84.5	9.3	6.2		
	Total	87.0	7.4	5.6		
4	Administrators	82.8	8.6	8.6		
	Faculty	86.3	5.9	7.7		
	Non-teaching	73.9	17.6	8.5	9.78*	27.87*
	Others	79.9	6.3	13.9		
	Parents	81.3	9.4	9.4		
	Total	83.1	8.0	8.9		
30	Administrators	90.3	4.3	5.4		
	Faculty	91.6	3.1	5.3		
	Non-teaching	92.8	4.3	2.9	0.70	12.56
	Others	95.2	4.1	0.7		
	Parents	97.9	1.0	1.0		
	Total	92.7	3.3	4.0		

**=Traditional Item

*p<.01

their reaction to two items (1 and 4). Of the experimental respondents, 73% indicated that they did not wish to participate in a school where teachers do their jobs independently and nearly 83% indicated that they would like to participate in a school where teachers interact with administrators in group meetings as equals. As might be expected, the control group revealed a more traditional attitude with 58% disagreeing with the first of these items and 72% agreeing with the second. The percentage responses in the respective disagree and agree columns for these items would be slightly higher if the controls were removed.

A significant difference in responses according to school position was also found for item 4 relating to interaction of administrators and teachers as equals in group meetings. The teachers displayed greater receptivity towards this idea, by several percentage points, than did the administrators. The other item (2) relating to administrator-teacher interaction did not reveal significant differences in the responses classified according to school position. In this case 76% of the administrators were in favor of informality in inter-communication with teachers as opposed to only 71% of the teachers.

Group differences were not significant for the other two items in this group (3 and 30), and responses were generally quite favorable in the expected direction. Approximately 90% of the respondents were receptive toward participation in a school where instructional problems are solved through a group process involving teachers and where the teachers feel a responsibility for helping solve school problems. It is interesting to note such a similar result in two items which were closely related but widely separated on the survey form.

Workflow structures. The six items listed below fall within the category of workflow structures.

9. teachers interview, individually or collectively, applicants for instructional positions--their response usually determines whether or not the applicant is hired.

**25. each teacher prepares his yearly curriculum outline on his own.

**28. the individual teacher exercises considerable autonomy in selecting the topics which he will include in courses which he teaches.

**5. the administration assumes responsibility for planning the instructional program, and teachers devote their attention to its implementation.

**13. it is assumed that the typical teacher prefers to be directed and therefore must be closely supervised in order to achieve school objectives.

15. the method used for solving problems is based on the assumption that ingenuity and creativity are widely distributed among school personnel.

**16. there are detailed written policies regulating teacher behavior.

17. teachers who do not wish to carry a full workload are employed as instructional personnel on a part-time basis.

18. the instructional staff may decide to purchase $8,000 worth of self-instructional materials instead of filling an authorized teaching position.

As is evident in Table 10, the experimental and control groups do not differ significantly on any items. The groups, differentiated according to school position, differed significantly on all of the items except the one (15) expressing the assumption that ingenuity and creativity are widely distributed among school personnel. Here, nearly 76% of the respondents indicated that they would like to participate in such a school and nearly 16% were uncertain.

**These items represent traditional staffing.

TABLE 10

Workflow Structures

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
9	Administrators	59.1	20.4	20.4		
	Faculty	60.8	16.9	22.3		
	Non-teaching	50.4	15.6	34.0	4.71	67.64*
	Others	36.3	26.0	37.7		
	Parents	27.4	21.1	51.6		
	Total	53.0	18.6	28.3		
**25	Administrators	24.7	7.5	67.7		
	Faculty	22.9	12.9	64.2		
	Non-teaching	22.0	28.4	49.6	2.16	37.95*
	Others	25.3	25.3	49.3		
	Parents	25.0	20.8	54.2		
	Total	23.5	16.8	59.7		
**28	Administrators	61.3	11.8	26.9		
	Faculty	61.3	17.6	21.1		
	Non-teaching	48.6	28.6	22.9	0.45	22.00*
	Others	53.2	20.6	26.2		
	Parents	45.4	25.8	28.8		
	Total	57.1	19.7	23.2		
**5	Administrators	11.8	2.2	86.0		
	Faculty	8.7	5.9	85.3		
	Non-teaching	19.9	20.6	59.6	1.02	130.03*
	Others	25.5	11.7	62.8	(2df)	(8df)
	Parents	37.6	18.3	44.1		
	Total	15.2	9.4	75.4		
**13	Administrators	9.7	4.3	86.0		
	Faculty	3.8	3.8	92.4		
	Non-teaching	17.0	7.8	75.2	1.10	63.47*
	Others	10.9	8.8	80.3		
	Parents	19.6	10.3	70.1		
	Total	8.4	5.6	86.0		
15	Administrators	84.9	7.5	7.5		
	Faculty	76.5	15.0	8.4		
	Non-teaching	69.3	16.4	14.3	6.16	12.44
	Others	75.2	16.6	8.3		
	Parents	70.8	15.6	13.5		
	Total	75.6	14.8	9.5		
**16	Administrators	29.3	13.0	57.6		
	Faculty	27.5	13.8	58.7		
	Non-teaching	50.0	20.3	29.4	5.02	71.73*
	Others	42.5	13.0	44.5		
	Parents	54.6	18.6	26.8		
	Total	35.1	14.9	50.0		
17	Administrators	71.0	14.0	15.1		
	Faculty	72.7	13.7	13.7		
	Non-teaching	58.2	24.1	17.7	6.85	28.92*
	Others	70.1	17.0	12.9		
	Parents	60.8	10.3	28.9		
	Total	69.2	15.2	15.6		
18	Administrators	54.8	15.1	30.1		
	Faculty	40.4	22.6	37.0		
	Non-teaching	19.9	29.1	51.1	2.46	61.10*
	Others	27.4	24.7	47.9		
	Parents	15.6	24.0	60.4		
	Total	35.0	23.2	41.8		

** Traditional Items

*p<.01

In the remaining eight items, (9, 25, 28, 5, 13, 16, 17, and 18), the administrators and teachers have responded more favorably in the expected direction than respondents of the other three groups. More than 85% of administrators and faculty disagreed with item #5 stating that planning is an administrative domain and implementation of these plans should be left to the faculty. Sixty percent of non-teachers disagreed, while only 40% of parents responding disagreed and 36% agreed. The range of agreement concerning whether teachers should have a major role in hiring prospective colleagues was from 27% for parents and "other" personnel to 60% for faculty and administrators.

Of the groups responding, the parents appear to be the least receptive to concepts underlying flexible staffing. For example, approximately 90% of the teachers and administrators were unreceptive toward the idea that the typical teacher likes to be supervised closely (#13) whereas only 70% of the parents were unreceptive; about 58% of the teachers and administrators were unreceptive toward detailed written policies regulating teacher behavior (#16) as opposed to only 27% of the parents; 71% of the teachers and administrators were in favor of employing part-time teachers (#17) as opposed to 61% of the parents; and 40% of the teachers and 55% of the administrators as opposed to 15% of the parents were in favor of giving the instructional staff freedom to purchase self instructional materials with funds authorized for a teaching position (#18).

All items were answered generally in the expected direction except item 28 which relates to the autonomy of the teacher in selecting his course topics. Sixty-one percent of the administrators and

teachers wished to participate in schools where teacher autonomy in this function was evident. Only 45% of the parents were in favor of such teacher autonomy. It is interesting to compare these responses to those of the item (25) expressing the concept that the teacher prepare his own yearly curriculum outline. Here, about 65% of the administrators and faculty and 54% of the parents disagreed with the concept. These responses seem incompatible unless one interprets item 28 as complete autonomy and item 25 as only partial autonomy within a predetermined set of curriculum options. Another interpretation would be that, since teachers implement the program, they inevitably determine the curriculum.

Perpetuation structures. Eight items, reproduced below, are included in the group relating to perpetuation structures.

6. teachers who have demonstrated exceptional skill and expertise as instructors receive instructional responsibilities and salaries considerably above that of other teachers.

*7. the opportunity exists for a teacher to serve half-time as an administrator and half-time as an instructor.

*10. teachers, with few exceptions, have duties and responsibilities which are different only in regard to subject area or grade level.

14. there is a deliberate attempt to recruit teachers whose special interests and abilities are consistent with school objectives.

19. teachers are employed on the basis of their interests and special abilities as well as on their certification status.

20. teachers are provided in-service training opportunities leading to increased instructional responsibility and increased pay.

21. paraprofessionals and other non-certified personnel are used in the classroom as instructional assistants.

22. promotions and advancements are based on evaluations of teachers' performance by subordinates, peers, superiors, and students.

The responses to these items are summarized in Table 11. Four items (10, 14, 21, and 22) in this group revealed significant differences in the responses of the control and experimental groups. Forty-one percent of the experimental group indicated that they would like to participate in a school where teachers have duties and responsibilities which are different only in regard to subject area or grade level and 40% of this group disagreed with this idea. These percentages for the control group were 63% and 18%, respectively. Although the differences between the control and the experimental groups were substantial in absolute terms, the response of the experimental group to this item is somewhat discouraging since vertical and horizontal differentiation of duties and responsibilities is perhaps the most fundamental concept of differentiated staffing. The responses in the disagree column of this table would be several percentage points higher with the responses of the controls removed. However, the receptivity of the various groups classified according to school position was still quite discouraging.

Eighty percent of the experimental group as opposed to 61% of the control group was receptive toward working in a school where teachers whose abilities and interests are consistent with school objectives (#14) are recruited; 82% of the experimental group as opposed to 68% of the control group was receptive toward the use of non-certified personnel as instructional aides in the classroom (#21); and 57% of the experimental group as opposed to 32% of the control group was receptive toward promoting teachers on the basis of evaluation by subordinates, peers, superiors, and students (#22). The percentages in the agree

TABLE 11
Perpetuation Structures

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control Experimental	x^2--School Position
6	Administrators	71.0	9.7	19.4		
	Faculty	48.5	22.3	29.2		
	Non-teaching	57.6	25.7	16.7	6.39	42.87*
	Others	61.9	23.8	14.3	(2df)	(8df)
	Parents	66.7	20.8	12.5		
	Total	55.1	21.7	23.2		
**7	Administrators	58.1	14.0	28.0		
	Faculty	51.2	17.3	31.6		
	Non-teaching	34.0	23.6	42.4	2.17	51.01*
	Others	43.5	34.0	22.4		
	Parents	29.2	25.0	45.8		
	Total	46.5	20.8	32.7		
**10	Administrators	31.5	10.9	57.6		
	Faculty	41.1	18.9	40.0		
	Non-teaching	51.4	20.4	28.2	15.33*	30.31*
	Others	38.2	20.8	41.0		
	Parents	51.0	24.0	25.0		
	Total	42.2	19.1	38.7		
14	Administrators	87.1	8.6	4.3		
	Faculty	78.8	13.5	7.7		
	Non-teaching	65.5	15.1	19.4	19.38*	30.80*
	Others	81.6	10.9	7.5		
	Parents	84.5	6.2	9.3		
	Total	78.7	12.3	9.0		
19	Administrators	88.2	9.7	2.2		
	Faculty	92.4	4.3	3.3		
	Non-teaching	87.5	8.3	4.2	6.11	11.71
	Others	95.1	3.5	1.4		
	Parents	93.8	4.1	2.1		
	Total	91.9	5.2	2.9		
20	Administrators	86.0	9.7	4.3		
	Faculty	86.5	7.9	5.6		
	Non-teaching	76.2	13.3	10.5	1.55	13.63
	Others	87.0	8.9	4.1		
	Parents	85.6	11.3	3.1		
	Total	85.1	9.2	5.7		
21	Administrators	94.6	2.2	3.2		
	Faculty	81.3	7.4	11.3		
	Non-teaching	81.8	8.4	9.8	9.81*	27.26*
	Others	80.6	11.1	8.3		
	Parents	68.0	10.3	21.6		
	Total	81.2	7.8	11.0		
22	Administrators	73.1	10.8	16.1		
	Faculty	49.0	21.3	29.7		
	Non-teaching	52.9	18.6	28.6	14.27*	32.24*
	Others	67.6	15.2	17.2		
	Parents	59.8	15.5	24.7		
	Total	55.0	18.7	26.3		

** Traditional Items

*p < .01

columns for these items would be slightly higher if the controls were omitted. Note, also, that these three items revealed significant differences among respondents classified according to school position, and that administrators appeared to be most receptive to all of these ideas.

Only two of the items (19 and 20) in this group did not reveal significant differences in responses classified according to school position. Ninety-two percent of the faculty respondents were receptive toward hiring teachers on the basis of their interests and special abilities as well as certification status (compare this with only 79% wishing to recruit teachers on the basis of special interests and skills), and 85% were receptive toward participation in a school where teachers are provided in-service training opportunities leading to increased responsibilities and salaries.

Although the total responses to the remaining two items (6 and 7) were heavily weighted by the large number of respondents in the faculty group, it is meaningful to note that the typical response to these items was around 50% agreement. Thus, receptivity does not seem especially high towards giving teachers who have demonstrated exceptional skill increased responsibilities and salaries (#6). Receptivity toward permitting teachers to seek advancement by gradually assuming administrative roles (#7) was higher than might be expected. Note that parents were least receptive to this traditional concept and that the administrators were most receptive.

Systems self-renewal. The category is represented by the following items.

**8. teachers generally feel that universities, demonstration schools, and research centers are set up for developing and testing new educational theories; this is not a part of the classroom role.

26. teachers' instructional activities are determined by written instructional goals.

From Table 12 it can be seen that there were no significant differences between control and experimental groups on these items, but that both items revealed significant differences according to the school position classifications. Again the administrators were generally the most receptive or unreceptive, depending on the direction of the item, toward the ideas expressed in these items.

TABLE 12

Systems Self-Renewal

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
**8	Administrators	4.3	17.2	78.5		
	Faculty	16.2	16.5	67.3		
	Non-teaching	28.9	31.7	39.4		
	Others	24.6	21.1	54.2	8.97	88.67*
	Parents	41.7	20.8	37.5		
	Total	20.2	19.6	60.2		
26	Administrators	63.4	15.1	21.5		
	Faculty	51.2	21.3	27.5		
	Non-teaching	45.7	34.1	20.3		
	Others	51.1	26.2	22.7	0.70	21.08*
	Parents	54.2	28.1	17.7		
	Total	51.8	23.6	24.6		

**=Traditional Items

*$p < .01$

Accountability. The five items reproduced below relate to accountability in flexible staffing.

23. the school periodically explains to parents and to the public in general the objectives of the school and the extent to which they are met.

*24. much of the teachers' time is spent in instructional activities which cannot be evaluated in terms of student behavior.

27. pupils' achievement is a factor used in evaluating teachers' performance.

29. budgetary appropriations are related to educational objectives.

31. the school periodically asks parents and the public for their opinions about school policy and objectives.

The summarized responses to these items appear in Table 13. The response to the two items 23 and 31 relating to the interaction of

TABLE 13

Accountability

Item Number	School Position	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Control-Experimental	x^2--School Position
23	Administrators	91.4	5.4	3.2		
	Faculty	94.3	3.8	2.0		
	Non-teaching	90.8	6.4	2.8	14.35* (2df)	8.15 (8df)
	Others	96.5	2.8	0.7		
	Parents	96.9	3.1	0.0		
	Total	94.1	4.1	1.8		
**24	Administrators	22.0	19.8	58.2		
	Faculty	29.0	25.2	45.7		
	Non-teaching	28.8	34.5	36.7	3.56	23.64*
	Others	23.7	30.9	45.3		
	Parents	24.0	41.7	34.4		
	Total	27.3	28.2	44.5		
27	Administrators	60.2	16.1	23.7		
	Faculty	42.7	21.7	35.6		
	Non-teaching	51.7	23.8	24.5	3.13	58.36*
	Others	67.6	18.3	14.1		
	Parents	71.1	13.4	15.5		
	Total	51.2	20.3	28.5		
29	Administrators	82.8	6.5	10.8		
	Faculty	74.4	14.5	11.1		
	Non-teaching	64.7	25.2	10.1	2,49	23.63*
	Others	82.1	9.0	9.0		
	Parents	79.4	12.4	8.2		
	Total	75.3	14.3	10.4		
31	Administrators	88.0	6.5	5.4		
	Faculty	80.0	8.9	11.1		
	Non-teaching	81.1	7.7	11.2	4.58	25.82*
	Others	91.0	6.9	2.1		
	Parents	93.8	5.2	1.0		
	Total	83.6	7.9	8.5		

**=Traditional Items

*p<.01

school and public are quite favorable. Ninety-four percent of the respondents indicated a desire to participate in a school which explained the objectives of the school and the extent to which they are met to the public. There were significant group differences according to school position to the second of these items. Here, only about 80% of the teachers and non-teaching personnel were in favor of asking the public for opinions about school policy as opposed to nearly 90% or more of the other groups. It is interesting to note that the parents agreed the most and disagreed the least with these items.

In the remaining three items, there were significant differences among the school position categories. Parents were very uncertain (41%) about whether they wanted teachers' time spent in instructional activities which could not be evaluated in terms of student behavior. The other groups were generally but not highly unreceptive toward this idea. Seventy-one percent of the parents were in favor of using pupils' achievement for evaluating teacher performance but only 43% of the teachers liked this idea. The response toward relating budgetary appropriations to educational objectives was generally favorable. Approximately 80% of the administrators and parents and 75% of the teachers were receptive to this idea.

Conclusion. Only seven of the comparisons between control and experimental groups revealed significant differences on Form 02. These differences were in statements which reflected the following areas of the Conceptual Model: individualism, collegiality, workflow structure, and perpetuation structures. In addition, 21 of the 31 items revealed significant differences among the various school positions. Overall,

the administrators seemed to be the most receptive toward flexible staffing concepts and the least receptive toward traditional staffing concepts. Twenty of the twenty-four items which demonstrated significant differences fell in the conceptual categories of the workflow structures, perpetuation structures, systems self-renewal, and accountability. Only one of the five items in the collegiality category revealed significant differences among the school position classifications, and neither of the two items in the individuality category revealed such differences.

Interrelationships of Forms 01 and 02

The administrators seemed to possess the best understanding of and were more receptive toward flexible staffing than any of the other groups. Chi-square analyses of the administrators' responses to the 31 items did not reveal significant differences between Forms 01 and 02 for any items. Thus, the proportions of the administrative group who perceive flexible staffing concepts correctly and who are receptive toward them are very similar. For example, on those items where only half the group correctly perceived flexible staffing, only about half of the other group of respondents indicated they would like to participate in such a school.

The same chi-square analyses for the group of teachers revealed ten items where significant differences occurred between perception (Form 01) and receptivity (Form 02). The responses to these items for teachers only are presented in Table 14. In four instances the teachers were more perceptive than receptive:

*1. individuals doing their own jobs independently.

*10. teachers having duties different only in subject matter or grade level.

18. purchase of materials rather than filling an authorized position.

26. written goals to determine teachers' activities.

The first two of these items expressed traditional concepts; the last two, flexible staffing concepts.

On six of the items, the teachers were more receptive than perceptive. These six items, all flexible staffing concepts, related to:

4. teachers and administrators interacting as equals.

14. recruiting teachers with special interests and abilities consistent with school objectives.

17. part-time employment of teachers.

19. employing teachers on the basis of special interests and abilities as well as certification status.

23. explanation of school goals to parents.

30. teachers feeling responsible for helping solve school problems.

In the first four items listed where correct perceptions were higher than favorable attitudes, it appears that there are some concepts of flexible staffing of which individuals were aware but not receptive. In the last six items it appears that individuals were receptive toward some ideas of flexible staffing without realizing that these ideas represent flexible staffing.

It is interesting to note that the responses to the items are quite similar across the two forms, even for those items reported in Table 20 where significant differences occurred between the various groups. More controlled research into the relationship of perception of and receptivity toward some flexible staffing concepts might be due primarily to

TABLE 14

Significant Chi-Square of
Contrasting Receptivity with Perception

Item Number		Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	x^2--Teachers-Experimental
*1	Perception	12.1	5.2	82.7	10.11*
	Receptivity	16.4	8.2	75.4	
4	Perception	77.2	11.1	11.7	22.66*
	Receptivity	87.7	5.7	6.6	
**10	Perception	32.4	16.9	50.7	9.37*
	Receptivity	39.7	18.1	42.2	
14	Perception	70.8	16.5	12.7	18.44*
	Receptivity	80.5	13.1	6.4	
17	Perception	62.4	20.2	17.4	21.39*
	Receptivity	74.6	12.4	13.0	
18	Perception	47.2	25.9	26.8	14.31*
	Receptivity	40.9	22.1	37.0	
19	Perception	87.4	6.1	6.5	12.34*
	Receptivity	93.3	3.9	2.8	
23	Perception	90.5	5.8	3.7	9.85*
	Receptivity	95.0	3.6	1.4	
26	Perception	60.4	15.8	23.8	9.81*
	Receptivity	51.7	20.7	27.6	
30	Perception	78.9	10.0	11.1	37.86*
	Receptivity	91.5	3.2	5.3	

**=Traditional Items *$p < .01$

misunderstanding of the rationale behind the concepts.

In addition to the analyses which were performed on each item, simple comparisons of the experimental and control groups across all items were made. Tables 15 and 16 show the number of items for which agreement among the experimental group exceeded the agreement level of the

TABLE 15

Percentage Differences in the Agreement Responses of the Control Group and the Experimental Group on Perception Items

	Items Consistent With Flexible Staffing	Items Consistent With Traditional Staffing
Experimental Group exceeds Control Group by 5% or more Agreement	16	2
Control Group Agreement exceeds the Experimental Group by 5% or more Agreement	0	3
Experimental Group and the Control Group have less than 5% difference	5	5

control group by 5% and, conversely, the number of items where the agreement level of the control group exceeded the agreement level of the experimental group by 5% or more. These results demonstrate that there is a definite tendency for the experimental group to agree more with statements consistent with flexible staffing and that the control group to agree more with statements consistent with traditional staffing.

TABLE 16

Percentage Differences in the Agreement Responses of the Control Group and the Experimental Group on the Receptivity Items

	Items Consistent With Flexible Staffing	Items Consistent With Traditional Staffing
Experimental Group exceeds Control Group by 5% or more Agreement	16	3
Control Group Agreement exceeds the Experimental Group Agreement by 5% or more	1	4
Experimental Group and the Control Group have less than 5% Difference	4	3

Part 2

Status Study on Project Goals, Goal Priorities, and Goal Implementation

Introduction

Essential to the assessment of the impact of the School Personnel Utilization Program was an evaluation of the goals upon which each project based its plans, processes, and activities. The delineation of objectives and the establishment of goal priorities during the developmental stage of each project were identified as two important dimensions of the SPU program. As a first step in the evaluation it was necessary to develop a standard set of goal statements which would be comprehensive enough for project personnel to accurately and completely describe their projects in terms of explicit, discrete goals. In order to have an expectation of the type of goal implementation which would hopefully take place within projects during the near future, the second step in the evaluation established the goal priorities of each project. In summary, it was necessary to determine first whether certain goals were included in the project, and second, to determine the priorities assigned to them by the project leadership. A logical ensuing step was a survey of the extent to which concrete efforts toward the fulfillment of project goals had been planned for and/or implemented.

Method

A selected list of 27 goal statements relating to six dimensions of the conceptual model was prepared from the more comprehensive set of SPU goals (see Appendix 2 for the complete list of revised SPU goals).

Specifically, six goal statements were selected which related to role and salary differentiation, four statements were related to in-service training, four statements referred to fulfilling individual needs, seven statements referred to communication, three statements related to professionalism, and three statements referred to evaluation. While each dimension of the conceptual model was not proportionately represented, it was felt that the list of 27 goal statements was both comprehensive and concise when one considers the extent of the overlap of the dimensions of the conceptual model.

From the goal statements a prototype evaluation instrument was devised to measure the criteria of "goal importance" and "goal implementation." This instrument was field tested on approximately 30 project directors and evaluation specialists at the SPU-LTI workshop held in Colorado Springs, Colorado, and revised on the basis of the results. The revised instrument was again field tested on the staff of the Norwood School, Dade County, Florida. At each field testing, and in the final version, respondents were requested to add goals which they felt should be included in the goal statements. As a result of the field trials, the final revision of the instrument contained revised goal statements, and each goal was illustrated by a specific example of a goal-related school activity. The final instrument was designated as Form 03, and it is presented in full in Appendix III.

In the final form, each respondent read a goal statement, then indicated how important he felt the goal statement was to his project and what he perceived to be the state of implementation of the goal in his project. Each respondent indicated his perception of the importance of each goal statement and the degree to which it had been implemented on two scales which followed each goal statement. On the importance scale

the respondent checked a "0" if he did not consider the statement to be a project goal, checked a "1" if the goal was of little importance, checked a "2" if the goal was of moderate importance, checked a "3" if the goal was of considerable importance, or a "4" if the goal was of the greatest importance. After completing a response to the importance scale, the respondent then completed the implementation scale. He checked a "0" if he felt the goal was not a project goal, checked a "1" if he felt a little planning had taken place to implement the goal, checked a "2" if plans to fulfill the goal were completed or nearly completed, checked a "3" if the plans and procedures for fulfilling the goal had been partially implemented, or checked a "4" if the plans and procedures for fulfilling this goal had been fully implemented.

The responses to the instrument were completed by three major groups within the 23 SPU projects. These groups were the project directors (one individual per project), the project committees, and "other" project participants (which consisted mainly of teachers, administrators, counselors, paraprofessionals, and parents who were not committee members). Of the 23 SPU projects, 18 project committees (126 total members), 10 project directors, 8 "other" groups (107 members) responded to the instrument. For each group from each school a mean item response was calculated for each statement on the importance scale and the implementation scale. Therefore, each of the 27 goal statements may be said to have a total of 36 mean responses on each scale: 18 committee means, 10 project directors' responses, and 8 "other" group means.

In the analysis of the data it was decided that the five categories of the response scales could be better understood if condensed. Therefore, all data will be reported on a three unit scale having the following characteristics:

IMPORTANCE SCALE:

1. This statement does not represent a goal, or if it does, the goal is not important.
2. This goal is moderately important.
3. This goal is very important.

IMPLEMENTATION SCALE:

1. This statement does not represent a project goal, or if it does, very little planning to implement the goal has taken place.
2. The plans for this goal are nearly completed.
3. The plans for this goal are implemented and in operation.

Form 03 was mailed to project schools shortly before their closing for the summer. Of the 23 projects funded through SPU which were selected for the impoact evaluation, 12 completed and returned Form 03 in time to meet the extended deadline of this report. Additional data are currently being received and will be included in a publication which will appear subsequent to this report. Those projects which did not respond to Form 03 (NR = no response), or who were unable to return their data in time to be processed for this report (RL = received late), are listed below:

Cherry Creek, Colo. (NR)
Board of Education, Chicago, Ill. (NR)
Coatesville, Pa. (RL)
Kansas City, Mo. (NR)
Marin County, Calif. (RL)
Mounds View, Minn. (NR)
Ontario-Montclair, Calif. (NR)
Portland, Ore. (RL)
Prince William County, Va. (NR)
Weber County, Utah (NR)

Some of the projects listed in Table 17 returned data from more than one school. Since each school typically had its own steering committee, a mean was calculated for each of the multiple schools within those projects, and their scores were handled as if they were an independent project. Consequently, the number of project committees exceeds the number of project directors reported in the results.

Table 17 lists the responses of the 12 projects grouped under three categories: Project directors, Committee members, and Other individuals. In three cases the response of the project director either was not returned or was not properly identified and therefore listed under the Committee member category.

The responses for each category were tabulated, and the means for each group, for each school, for each item on Form 03, were calculated. These results were used in two ways:

1. to rank the goal statements in order of importance and in order of the degree of implementation, and
2. to develop an importance/implementation matrix described later in the results.

Because of the spotty return and our treatment of the data, the results of this survey must not be extrapolated to represent the views of all the SPU projects, but must be limited to the population described in Table 17. The geographical variety as well as the different types of schools reporting do, however, allow for some generalizing concerning the general state of flexible staffing implementation across the country.

The full contribution of Form 03, though somewhat dimmed by the lack of data, is better demonstrated in the implementation status reported in Volume IV of this report.

Results

The Ranking of Goal Statements. The responses of the committee members on the goal statements were ranked in order to clearly delineate those goals which were considered by the members to be most important and most fully implemented. The project committee members' responses were used to perform this ranking, since this group constituted the largest and most representative sample of individuals in SPU projects and was the group most

Table 17

Number of Individuals Responding to
Form 03 from the 23 SPU Projects

Project Name	Project Directors	Committee Members	Other Individuals
Anniston, Alabama	1	8	
Beaverton, Oregon	1	13	
Carson City, Nevada (WSSSP)	1	4	5
Dade County, Florida		5	
Hood River, Oregon	1	5	5
Laguna Beach, California	1	4	24
Louisville, Kentucky			3
Leon County, Florida	1	6	
Mesa, Arizona	1	9	
New York, New York	1	4	
Sarasota, Florida (4 schools)	1	22	76
Temple City, California		8	
Wayne County, Michigan	1	3	
Brookings, South Dakota (2 schools)		35	
Totals	10	126	107

likely to know the actual status of priorities among project goals and the degree of implementation. In Table 18 the ranking of the goals by importance is presented. The goal number is listed down the left hand side of the table, and the three "importance levels" are listed across the top of the table. Those goals which were ranked by the project committees as "most important" appear at the top of the list, and the "least important" goals appear at the bottom. The ranking process was carried out on the "very important" column, thus there may not be a strict linearity of rank in the "important" and "not important" columns.

The ordering of goals on the importance scale lends itself readily to interpretation. One very obvious result was that all project committees considered goal #4 to be very important:

4. To make effective use of available resources within the existing structure.

   e.g. Provide teachers with adequate non-professional help, such as clerical aides and paraprofessionals, and promote community volunteerism to provide additional support of tne instructional program.

At least two-thirds of the project committees also considered the following goals as very important:

2. To differentiate staff responsibilities as required by effective accomplishment of tasks.

   e.g. Write job descriptions which describe a logical breakdown of tasks and recruit personnel on the basis of those descriptions.

14. To provide each child with learning resources (human and material) that are appropriate to his individual needs.

   e.g. Training instructional personnel to develop learning materials based on performance objectives and written at various levels of complexity.

Table 18

Goal Statements as Ranked by Project Committees
Responding to the Criteria of Importance

Goal Statement Number	Number of Committees which Rated the Goal as		
	Very Important	Important	Not Important
4	18	0	0
2	16	2	0
14	16	1	1
1	15	3	0
7	14	4	0
17	14	4	0
16	13	5	0
13	13	4	1
9	12	6	0
18	11	7	0
20	11	6	1
12	10	7	1
25	10	6	2
27	9	8	1
5	9	5	4
6	9	5	4
3	7	9	2
22	5	11	2
15	5	9	4
10	4	12	2
23	4	12	2
19	4	11	3
11	3	13	2
26	3	12	3
21	2	5	11
8	1	10	7
24	1	0	17

1. To more effectively use human resources through role differentiation and specialization.

   e.g. Develop a staffing pattern which allows people to assume different amounts of responsibility and receive commensurate salary differentials within instructional and/or administrative divisions.

7. To provide continuous and relevant staff retraining to insure quality instruction in the schools.

   e.g. Establishing inservice training programs based on specific objectives which provide for specialization of individual talent.

17. To insure that decisions are influenced by individuals who are responsible for their implementation.

   e.g. Establish decision-making procedures which actively involve the instructional staff, students and administrators.

16. To establish a climate that encourages interaction among personnel at all levels.

   e.g. Eliminate, where possible, scheduling and staffing restraints to interaction; establish problem solving groups which cut across administrative, instructional staff student categories.

13. To increase the instructional staff's professional commitment to the student.

   e.g. Provide training to foster a positive attitude on the part of the staff toward all children, regardless of their ethnic background, religion, sex, color or ability.

9. To improve interpersonal relations skills.

   e.g. Establish inservice training which is focused on helping people to work more effectively with others.

No clear relationships exist between these goals, except perhaps that they represent the most highly disseminated dimensions of the concept of flexible staffing. The following goals were considered as "not important" by most of the project committees:

8. To facilitate the professional teacher organization's role in combating obsolescence among the instructional staff of the school.

   e.g. Requesting the professional organization's participation in planning and execution of inservice training for the instructional staff.

24. To gradually transfer credentialing authority to the professional teachers' organization.

   e.g. Recommend that the State Department of Education allow the professional organization to assume credentialing authority.

21. To establish a means for disseminating information concerning the project to other non-project schools in the system.

   e.g. Establishing a teacher exchange system where project and non-project teachers will exchange jobs for a period of time.

A logical analysis of these results within the context of the conceptual framework reveals several serious gaps in the alternative staffing patterns being developed. Goal statement No. 4, which suggests that aides and clerks be used within the existing conventional staffing structure, was selected as being very important by all eighteen project schools. Yet only seven committees felt that placing teacher promotion on a performance base was very important (No. 3) and only nine committees reported they considered relating remuneration to the type and amount of responsibility a teacher assumed as being very important (No. 6). This suggests that many projects have expanded the aide's para-professional role rather than the teacher's professional role. One might speculate that these committees looked at their own accomplishments in staffing innovation, which at the most elementary level normally includes the use of clerks and para-professionals, and labeled them as being very important. Or perhaps the use of para-professionals and clerks as assistants to classroom teachers represents the least common denominator of a definition of flexible

staffing acceptable to such a diverse group of staffing projects. Whatever the reason, it must be rather disappointing to the differentiated staffing evangelist to learn that using para-professionals within the existing structure was viewed important by project committees twice as often as goal statement No. 2 (differentiated responsibilities) or goal statement No. 1 (role specialization tied to salary differentials).

Despite goal statement No. 4's receiving unanimous approval, the remaining eight goal statements selected to be very important by most committees focused on variables requiring changes in the existing organizational structure--those structures which are established in order to recruit, employ, retrain and retain human resources for staffing the organization--and on variables of communication and human relations.

Goal statements developed around variables of evaluation and accountability (goal statements Nos. 25, 26, and 27) were viewed with somewhat less enthusiasm, but were nevertheless well within the important category.

While the staff of the project schools' planning committees agree that increased professional demeanor of teachers toward students was a very important goal of the flexible staffing concept, the list of unimportant goals (goal statements Nos. 8 and 24) indicates they have not yet accepted the dimension of professionalism which places the professional organization in control of the conduct and quality of the performance of its members. At this point in the development of the concept, teachers are generally unwilling to invest much into the effort of assuming the credentialing and quality monitoring and continued upgrading of competence of their colleagues through a professional organization. Professionalism in the fuller sense of the term is not viewed as an important component of the concept of flexible or differentiated staffing (see DeBloois, 1970).

Table 19

Goal Statements as Ranked by Project Committees
Responding to the Criteria of Implementation Level

Goal Statement Number	Number of Committees Which Rated the Goal as:		
	Fully Implemented	Plans Nearly Completed	Not a Goal Little Planning
2	6	8	4
1	6	7	5
17	5	8	5
14	4	10	4
4	4	9	5
18	4	9	5
5	3	7	8
7	2	12	4
6	2	8	8
9	1	11	6
20	1	11	6
25	1	10	7
16	0	11	7
13	1	9	8
12	1	8	9
10	0	8	10
15	0	8	10
26	1	5	12
27	1	5	12
22	0	6	12
11	0	6	12
3	0	5	13
19	0	5	13
21	1	3	14
23	1	3	14
8	0	3	15
24	0	0	18

The Project committees' ranking of goal statements by levels of implementation is found in Table 19. Here the committees provide a profile of the status of goal achievement across the 12 projects. Form 03 was designed to elicit committee member's perception of the importance and status of goal implementation. No attempt to document these perceptions was made, except in the intensive evaluation of five projects reported in Volume IV of this report. In those case studies, responses on Form 03 were validated through an interview survey.

According to the foregoing tables, only from four to six projects claimed to have implemented six goals:

2. To differentiate staff responsibilities as required by effective accomplishment of tasks.

   e.g. Write job descriptions which describe a logical breakdown of tasks and recruit personnel on the basis of those descriptions.

1. To more effectively use human resources through role differentiation and specialization.

   e.g. Develop a staffing pattern which allows people to assume different amounts of responsibility and receive commensurate salary differentials within instructional and/or administrative divisions.

17. To insure that decisions are influenced by individuals who are responsible for their implementation.

   e.g. Establish decision-making procedures which actively involve the instructional staff, students, and administrators.

14. To provide each child with learning resources (human and material) that are appropriate to his individual needs.

   e.g. Training instructional personnel to develop learning materials based on performance objectives and written at various levels of complexity.

4. To make effective use of available resources within the existing structure.

e.g. Provide teachers with adequate non-professional help, such as clerical aides and para-professionals, and promote community volunteerism to provide additional support of the instructional program.

18. To establish cooperative efforts among the instructional staff of the school; i.e., collective planning, implementation and evaluation.

e.g. Organizing decision-making bodies such as academic senates, curriculum counsels, and multi-discipline teaching teams.

From seven to ten projects claimed plans nearly complete for these same goals, while only four or five projects showed little planning relative to these goals.

The influence of the USOE funding guidelines is obvious here. It appears both in which goals were chosen to implement, as well as which goals were deemed most important in a flexible staffing endeavor, that project personnel were keenly aware of the structural aspects of the concept. Placing a staff in a vertical hierarchy with specialized goals, and developing cooperative planning bodies within the school seemed to take precedence over socio-psychological considerations as described in the DeBloois conceptual model under the headings of Individualism, Collegiality, and Professionalism.

The project personnel of seven to twelve projects felt these eleven goals were in the process of being implemented:

5. To develop a recruitment policy which is consistent with stated school objectives.

e.g. Write job descriptions in cooperation with the instructional staff based on school objectives to guide recruitment efforts.

7. To provide continuous and relevant staff retraining to insure quality instruction in the schools.

e.g. Establishing inservice training programs based on specific objectives which provide for specialization of individual talent.

6. To relate remuneration to the type and amount of responsibility one carries.

   e.g. Establish roughly parallel salary schedules for differentiated administrative and instructional positions.

9. To improve interpersonal relations skills.

   e.g. Establish inservice training which is focused on helping people to work more effectively with others.

20. To adopt a formal organization which is consistent with staff perceptions of leadership.

   e.g. Selecting individuals for positions of leadership based on criteria developed by those directly affected by the choice.

25. To assess the project's progress effectiveness on a continuous basis.

   e.g. Training personnel in the organization in formative evaluation.

16. To establish a climate that encourages interaction among personnel at all levels.

   e.g. Eliminate, where possible, scheduling and staffing restraints to interaction; establish problem-solving groups which cut across administrative, instructional staff, and student categories.

13. To increase the instructional staff's professional commitment to the student.

   e.g. Provide training to foster a positive attitude on the part of the staff toward all children, regardless of their ethnic background, religion, sex, color. or ability.

12. To develop school policies which are consistent with its current philosophy concerning human motivation.

   e.g. Provide more positive incentives and minimize coercion as the basis for individual participation.

32. To provide teacher training institutions information concerning the expectations staffing innovations require of pre-service training.

   e.g. Establish a cooperative training effort with local colleges and universities.

15. To improve communication among all personnel in the organization.

    e.g. Hiring a qualified consultant to work with an in-house committee to establish an information flow system.

One might argue, after comparing the list of six most implemented goals with the list of eleven goals for which plans are nearly complete, that the tail is wagging the dog. Perhaps in an effort to fulfill contractual agreements with the funding source, or perhaps as a strategy to receive second or third year funding, projects have implemented terminal goals without having implemented the necessary enabling strategies. As an illustration of this, six projects indicated they had implemented goal Nos. 1 and 2, both dealing with staff differentiation and role specialization; yet, only two projects indicated they had implemented goal No. 7 which provides inservice training for role specialization. It appears that many of the projects are changing labels first to achieve a differentiated staff, and then training for role specialties later, or not at all.

Along the same vein, it appears that project leadership is attempting to establish cooperative decision-making bodies (goal statement No. 18, Table 19) before they provide a staff additional training in interpersonal relations skills, and before they effect a change in climate of communication (goal statement Nos. 9, 16, 12, and 15, Table 19).

Further analysis provides a bit of irony. A comparison of Table 18 and Table 19 shows that sixteen of the eighteen projects felt that continuous formative evaluation (goal statement No. 25) was either very important or important; however, only one project claims to be monitoring its own progress continuously through formative evaluative efforts. Eleven projects, after a year of operation, have plans nearly complete to

implement a formative scheme of evaluation and seven projects have done little or no planning for any evaluation of a formative nature.

Twelve to eighteen of the projects indicated they had one little or no planning for the implementation of ten goal statements on Form 03. From three to five projects claimed plans were nearly complete for these same ten goal statements, and only one project claimed any implementation for a number of the ten goal statements. These ten goal statements include:

26. To establish an accountability system through which the institution can account for costs in terms of instructional effectiveness and efficiency to its several publics.

    e.g. Establish a program planning system which ties budgeting directly to educational outcomes.

27. To develop a comprehensive system for periodic goal analysis, planning, development, and evaluation of the instructional program.

    e.g. Explore the potential of a system's self-renewal process model with the assistance of a qualified evaluation specialist.

22. An increased commitment to have the school staff maintain a professional role.

    e.g. Formal review by the instructional staff of all school procedures and regulations in terms of a Professional Code of Ethics which encourages the staff to perform in a manner they assess to be more professional.

11. To help teachers and students become the type of person they choose to be.

    e.g. Encourage constructive pluralism and diversity rather than conformity to conventional educational roles. Staff and students are freed from arbitrary restraints such as dress codes, leisure time use restrictions, and curtailment of political activity.

3. To develop a performance-based promotion system.

   e.g. Establish reliable, valid performance criteria for promotion which are consistent with the instructional objectives.

19. To insure an equitable exchange of expected services and benefits between the organization and its members.

   e.g. Survey school personnel to determine if teachers are doing what they anticipated when they were hired, and if they are being rewarded by the institution as they expected.

21. To establish a means for disseminating information concerning the project to other non-project schools in the system.

   e.g. Establishing a teacher exchange system where project and non-project teachers will exchange jobs for a period of time.

23. To increase the professional commitment of the instructional staff to the public trust.

   e.g. Encourage teachers to act as champions of sound community policy; counterparts to public and special interest groups which are sometimes shortsighted in their educational views.

8. To facilitate the professional teacher organization's role in combating obsolescence among the instructional staff of the school.

   e.g. Requesting the professional organization's participation in planning and execution of inservice training for the instructional staff.

24. To gradually transfer credentialing authority to the professional teachers' organization.

   e.g. Recommend that the State Department of Education allow the professional organization to assume credentialing authority.

The Development of an Importance/Implementation Matrix. The importance of a goal and its level of implementation in a project are two concepts, which by their very nature are closely linked. If a goal is important to a

project, it should rank high on the priority list for the process of implementation of the goal. If a goal is not important, little time or effort should be expended in planning to implement the goal, and certainly no unimportant goal should be fully implemented. Of course, "important" is a relative term. What is important to a project director may not be important to a project committee, and so a comparison of these two groups has been made in order to sort out the relationships between the level of importance of the goal and its degree of implementation.

To accomplish this task, an importance/implementation matrix was devised. The basic form of the matrix consists of three columns representing the three levels of importance, crossed with three rows which represent the three levels of implementation. The rows were subdivided into two sub-rows, one representing the project director and one the committee. A cross tabulation of the responses of the project directors and the project committees was made, and the results appear in Table 20. The results are expressed as percent in order to make simple comparisons as the percent of goals classified into each category by each group. For example, in Table 20, column 1, row 1, the project directors have classified 48.5% of the goals as "very important--implemented," and the committee members have classified 8.6% of the goals in the same manner.

A chi-square test of statistical difference between the response patterns of project directors and project committees was made, and it was determined that the responses of the two groups were significantly different (X^2 = 211, d.f. = 8, p. less than 0.001). The major differences between the two groups lie in the proportion of responses placed in the following categories. The project directors viewed 48% of the goals as

Table 20

The Classification of the Responses of the Project Directors and the Project Committees On an Importance/Implementation Matrix

Implementation Level		Importance Level		
		Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Important
Plans Implemented	Project Director	48.5%	3.7%	1.8%
	Project Committee	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Plans Nearly Complete	Project Director	15.5%	1.8%	1.4%
	Project Committee	27.4%	13.3%	0.0%
Not a Goal or Little Planning	Project Director	7%	7.7%	7.7%
	Project Committee	13.2%	22.8%	13.4%

important and implemented, while the committee members only viewed 8.6% of the goals in the same manner. The committee members tended to place the "very important" goals into the "nearly completed" or "little planning" category (committee members exceeded project directors in both these categories). Again, in both the "moderately important" and "not a goal" categories, the project directors viewed the level of implementation as being higher than did the committee members. This response could be the result of project managers having more current information than committee members, hence know of more goals which have been currently implemented; or it might be the "rose colored glasses" effect, in which the project managers have a different perspective of project activity than do the committee members. The results of on-sight validation studies, in which evidence of reported implementation was sought, clearly indicates that the faculties sometimes underestimate the level of implementation on a school-wide basis; the project directors typically overestimate the level of implementation; and the steering committees most accurately report level of implementation. It is also interesting to note that 75% of the responses of project directors fell in the "very important" column compared with approximately 50% of the responses of the steering committees.

The most desirable situation, "plans implemented--very important," has the largest total percentage response, a favorable finding. The "little planning--not a goal category" has a moderately small total percentage response, hence is also a favorable finding. If a goal is considered as not important, little time or effort should be expended on the goal. The "very important--little planning" category has a moderately large total percentage response, hence is not a favorable finding.

An investigation of specific goals was made by placing them into the importance-implementation matrix. An examination of the placement of the goals in the matrix shows that project directors and project committees placed goal No. 24 most often in the "not a goal--no planning" area of the matrix; thus relegating this goal to the lowest priority on both scales. The committees also considered goal No. 21 in the same context. Goal No. 24 deals with the process of gradually transferring credentialing authority to the professional teachers' organization, and it is not unexpected to find all the respondents unanimous in the opinion that this is a goal of little importance, since this is probably the least disseminated and most "radical" of all the goals proposed for school personnel utilization. Goal No. 21 concerns itself with the dissemination of porject information to other schools in the system. Project committees more frequently placed in the area of "not a goal--no planning" while the responses of the projects ranged more widely over the matrix. The agreement among committees as to the minimal importance of this goal together with little planning for it may be a kind of academic ethnocentrism resulting from the committees' deep immersion in and concentration on their individual projects. It is possible that their opinions regarding dissemination will be completely different following the successful implementation and evaluation of their more immediate plans. Project directors, being more aware of the relationship of the project to the total school system and the implications of the project for the total differentiated staffing concept, apparently took a more positive view of the importance of dissemination.

What can be said about the distribution of other goals by directors and committees? As evidence by the chi-square test, trends do not clearly

emerge. Project directors assigned goals Nos. 1 and 2 to "very important--plans implemented" with high frequency, while project committees assigned Nos. 1 and 2 to this category with moderate frequency. For these two goals, moderate consistency may be a consideration. Both goals are concerned with staffing pattern and it is logical that directors and committees should view them as important. The fact that they also view them as implemented may be an indication that the majority of the projects have given highest priority to staffing pattern regardless of the developmental stage of the project.

Some similarities have been noted between project directors and committees, but there is too much that is contradictory to offer further general interpretation. The results of this survey have confirmed certain a priori assumptions; a major one being that division of labor between faculty and aides is a prime goal of the projects; another, that a major change in traditional credentialing procedure is a remote objective of school personnel utilization projects; another, perhaps less substantiated idea, that dissemination is an important aspect of project implementation according to some project directors, but not according to their committees. Further interpretation must be left to the individual projects to whom the results of the survey were given. Each one had the opportunity of viewing his own project in the light of the evidence and in comparison to other projects. Each project may then make revisions or assign new priorities as a result of the formative evaluation.

References

DeBloois, Michael, "A Conceptual Model for Organizational-Structural Innovations," Evaluation Training Center, Department of Educational Research, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1970.*

*The reference listed above may be secured from:

The Evaluation Training Center
Department of Educational Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Appendix - Volume III

Cover Sheet for all Forms

Form 01

Form 02

Form 03

COVER SHEET FOR ALL FORMS

Project Code No._____

School Personnel Utilization

Information Area:

The first several items on the answer sheet are used for coding information to be used in analysis of the data.

Please mark your response to these items on the separate answer sheet in the same way that you will mark the answers to the attached instrument.

Make sure that the item marked on the answer sheet corresponds to the item you are responding to.

ITEM

1. The position I hold in the Differentiated Staffing project is:
   (0) Project Director
   (1) Project committee or steering committee member
   (2) Other project participant
   (3) Not a project participant

2. The position I hold in the school system is:
   (0) School Board member
   (1) District administrative staff
   (2) School administrative staff
   (3) Faculty of a school
   (4) Non-teaching personnel of a school
   (5) Consultant to the system
   (6) Other

3. School level (if appropriate)
   (0) Elementary
   (1) Junior High or Middle School
   (2) High School
   (3) K-12

4. Sex
   (0) Female (1) Male

5. Years of experience in education
   (0) 0-1 (4) 11-15
   (1) 2-3 (5) 16-20
   (2) 4-6 (6) 21 or over
   (3) 7-10

ITEM

6. I am a member of:
   (0) No professional organization
   (1) NEA or state educational association
   (2) AFT
   (3) Other

7. I am an officer of a professional education organization:
   (0) Yes
   (1) No

(Items 8-10) Mark the response position corresponding to the:

8. left digit of the project code number,

9. center digit of the project code number,

10. right digit of the project code number,

11. The left digit of the form number given in the upper left corner of this page is:

12. The right digit of the form number given in the upper left corner of this page is:

School Personnel Utilization

Flexible Staffing Perceptivity Survey

Form 01

This inquiry is designed to determine your personal perception of the concept: Flexible Staffing. Each item consists of a description of a school situation and a scale for indicating whether or not you agree that the described situation would typically occur in a school having Flexible Staffing.

Please circle the number on the scale that best describes your personal perception and then mark the position corresponding to that number on the separate answer sheet with a lead pencil (no pens, please).

Make sure that the item number on the answer sheet matches the number of the item to which you are responding.

* * * *

I personally perceive Flexible Staffing to be a school organization in which

		strongly agree	agree	uncertain	disagree	strongly disagree
7.	the opportunity exists for a teacher to serve half-time as an administrator and half-time as an instructor.	0	1	2	3	4
8.	teachers generally feel that universities, demonstration schools and research centers are set up for developing and testing new educational theories; this is not a part of the classroom role.	0	1	2	3	4
9.	teachers interview, individually or collectively, applicants for instructional positions--their response usually determines whether or not the applicant is hired.	0	1	2	3	4
10.	teachers, with few exceptions, have duties and responsibilities which are different only in regard to subject area or grade level.	0	1	2	3	4
11.	teachers are encouraged to attain their own career goals within the instructional staff even though the goals of different teachers may vary widely.	0	1	2	3	4
12.	a teacher who is adept at working with small groups may spend most of his time doing so.	0	1	2	3	4
13.	it is assumed that the typical teacher prefers to be directed and therefore must be closely supervised in order to achieve school objectives.	0	1	2	3	4
14.	there is a deliberate attempt to recruit teachers whose special interests and abilities are consistent with school objectives.	0	1	2	3	4
15.	the method used for solving problems is based on the assumption that ingenuity and creativity are widely distributed among school personnel.	0	1	2	3	4

I personally perceive Flexible Staffing to be a school organization in which.

		strongly agree	agree	uncertain	disagree	strongly disagree
16.	there are detailed written policies regulating teacher behavior.	0	1	2	3	4
17.	teachers who do not wish to carry a full workload are employed as instructional personnel on a part-time basis.	0	1	2	3	4
18.	the instructional staff may decide to purchase $8,000 worth of self instructional materials instead of fill an authorized teaching position.	0	1	2	3	4
19.	teachers are employed on the basis of their interests and special abilities as well as on their certification status.	0	1	2	3	4
20.	teachers are provided in-service training opportunities leading to increased instructional responsibility and increased pay.	0	1	2	3	4
21.	paraprofessionals and other non-certified personnel are used in the classroom as instructional assistants.	0	1	2	3	4
22.	promotions and advancements are based on evaluations of the teachers' performance by subordinates, peers, superiors, and students.	0	1	2	3	4
23.	the school periodically explains to parents and to the public in general the objectives of the school and the extent to which they are met.	0	1	2	3	4
24.	much of the teachers' time is spent in instructional activities which cannot be evaluated in terms of student behavior.	0	1	2	3	4
25.	each teacher prepares his yearly curriculum outline on his own.	0	1	2	3	4

I personally perceive Flexible Staffing to be a school organization in which:	strongly agree	agree	uncertain	disagree	strongly disagree
26. teachers' instructional activities are determined by written instructional goals.	0	1	2	3	4
27. pupils' achievement is a factor used in evaluating teachers' performance.	0	1	2	3	4
28. the individual teacher exercises considerable autonomy in selecting the topics which he will include in the courses which he teaches.	0	1	2	3	4
29. budgetary appropriations are related to educational objectives.	0	1	2	3	4
30. teachers usually approach faculty meetings with a sense of responsibility for helping solve school problems.	0	1	2	3	4
31. the school periodically asks parents and the public for their opinions about school policy and objectives.	0	1	2	3	4

School Personnel Utilization

Flexible Staffing Receptivity Survey

Form 02

This inquiry is intended to find out which of several school situations you would, or would not, like to participate in. Your responses will be anonymous and you should be as frank as possible. Lack of frankness could encourage the adoption of inappropriate organizational structures.

Please read each item carefully and then indicate your feeling about working in the described situation. Mark the position on the answer sheet which corresponds to your response.

Make sure that the item number marked on the answer sheet is the same as that of the item you are responding to.

* *

I would like to be a participant (teacher, administrator, parent, etc.) in a school in which:	strongly agree	agree	uncertain	disagree	strongly disagree
	0	1	2	3	4
1. individual teachers do their own jobs independently of other members of the staff.					
2. informality is evident in instructional and administrative intercommunications.					

NOTE: The statements on this form duplicate the statements found on Form 01.

School Personnel Utilization

Goal Status Survey

Form 03

The purpose of this survey is to describe the objectives of the many SPU projects in terms of a comprehensive set of underlying goals. In addition to this descriptive function, this questionnaire will be used to identify shifts in projects goals which often occur during the developmental and implementation stages. The results will be fed back to each project for purposes of self-study and will be incorporated with the results of other porjects so that others may benefit from the collective experience of the SPU program.

The questionnaire consists of general goal statements, each of which is illustrated by a specific goal-related activity intended to help clarify the goal statement. We recognize that in asking you to describe your project in terms of these general goal statements, we have set a difficult task. Several activities or objectives are often designed to contribute to a single goal, and a single objective may contribute to several outcomes, including some which are not intended. For our purposes, it is important that you specify only intended goals and outcomes of the SPU project, rather than possible side effects or related goals of the school for which the SPU project has no responsibility. Space is provided for you to write in the goal or goal activity you have in mind (or may other comment) when in doubt about an answer. These comments will be of great value to our interpretation of the data.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORM 03

Please read carefully. Detach this sheet and use it for reference while marking your response sheet.

Scale A. Read each item as a goal statement and mark the number on the answer sheet which corresponds to the most appropriate of the following responses:

0. Not considered a project goal at this time.

1. Considered a project goal at this time, but little planning for its fulfillment has been done.

2. Plans to fulfill this particular goal are complete or nearly complete.

3. Plans and procedures for fulfilling this goal have been partially implemented.

4. Plans and procedures for fulfilling this goal have been fully implemented.

Scale B. After marking your response to Part A, mark the number on the answer sheet which corresponds to your perception of the relative importance of the goal as follows:

0. Not considered a project goal at this time.

1. A goal of relatively little importance to our project.

2. A goal of moderate importance to our project.

3. A goal of considerable importance to our project.

4. A goal of greatest importance to our project.

NOTE: Responding positively to the goal does not imply an acceptance of the example.

BE CERTAIN TO RESPOND TO BOTH PART A AND PART B OF EACH ITEM BEFORE CONTINUING.

Goals Related to Role and Salary Differentiation

Goal Statement Nos.**	Response Sheet Nos.		Scale A	Scale B
			1	2
1.	1/2.	To more effectively use human resources through role differentiation and specialization	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4
		e.g. Develop a staffing pattern which allows people to assume different amounts of responsibility and receive commensurate salary differentials within instructional and/or administrative division.		
		Comments:		
			3	4
2.	3/4.	To differentiate staff responsibilities as required by effective accomplishment of tasks.	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4
		e.g. Write job descriptions which describe a logical breakdown of tasks and recruit personnel on the basis of those descriptions.		
		Comments:		
			5	6
3.	5/6.	To develop a performance-based promotion system.	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4
		e.g. Establish reliable, valid performance criteria for promotion which are consistent with the instructional objectives.		
		Comments:		
			7	8
4.	7/8.	To make effective use of available resources within the existing structure.	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4
		e.g. Provide teachers with adequate non-professional help, such as clerical aides and paraprofessionals, and promote community volunteerism to provide additional support of the instructional program.		
		Comments:		

**NOTE: All references in final report refer to these numbers.

Goal Statement Nos.	Response Sheet Nos.		Scale A	Scale B
			9	10
5.	9/10.	To develop a recruitment policy which is consistent with stated school objectives.	0	0
			1	1
		e.g. Write job descriptions in cooperation with the instructional staff based on school objectives to guide recruitment efforts.	2	2
			3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		
			11	12
6.	11/12.	To relate renumeration to the type and amount of responsibility one carries.	0	0
			1	1
		e.g. Establish roughly parallel salary schedules for differentiated administrative and instructional positions.	2	2
			3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		
		Goals related to Inservice Training		
			13	14
7.	13/14.	To provide continuous and relevant staff retraining to insure quality instruction in the schools.	0	0
			1	1
			2	2
		e.g. Establishing inservice training programs based on specific objectives which provide for specialization of individual talent.	3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		
			15	16
8.	15/16.	To facilitate the professional teacher organization's role in combating obsolescence among the instructional staff of the school.	0	0
			1	1
			2	2
		e.g. Requesting the professional organization's participation in planning and execution of inservice training for the the instructional staff.	3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		

Goal Statement Nos.	Response Sheet Nos.		Scale A	Scale B
			17	18
9.	17/18.	To improve interpersonal relations skills.	0	0
		e.g. Establish inservice training which is focused on helping people to work more effectively with others.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
		Comments:		
			19	20
10.	19/20.	To provide teacher training institutions information concerning the expectations staffing innovations require of pre-service training.	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
		e.g. Establish a cooperative training effort with local colleges and universities.	4	4
		Comments:		
		Goals Related to Fulfilling Individual Needs		
			21	22
11.	21/22.	To help teachers and students become the type of person they choose to be.	0	0
		e.g. Encourage constructive pluralism and diversity rather than conformity to conventional educational roles. Staff and students are freed from arbitrary restraints such as dress codes, leisure time use restrictions, and curtailment of political activity.	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
		Comments:		
			23	24
12.	23/24.	To develop school policies which are consistent with its current philosophy concerning human motivation.	0 1 2	0 1 2
		e.g. Provide more positive incentives and minimize coercion as the basis for individual participation.	3 4	3 4
		Comments:		

Goal Statement Nos.	Response Sheet Nos.		Scale A	Scale B
			38	39
13.	25/26.	To increase the instructional staff's professional commitment to the student.	0	0
			1	1
		e.g. Provide training to foster a positive attitude attitude on the part of the staff toward all children, regardless of their ethnic background, religion, sex, color or ability.	2	2
			3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		
			27	28
14.	27/28.	To provide each child with learning resources (human and material) that are appropriate to his individual needs.	0	0
			1	1
			2	2
		e.g. Training instructional personnel to develop learning materials based on performance objectives and written at various levels of complexity.	3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		
		Goals Related to Communication		
			29	30
15.	29/30.	To improve communication among all personnel in the organization.	0	0
			1	1
		e.g. Hiring a qualified consultant to work with an in-house committee to establish an information flow system.	2	2
			3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		
			31	32
16.	31/32.	To establish a climate that encourages interaction among personnel at all levels.	0	0
			1	1
		e.g. Eliminate, where possible, scheduling and staffing restraints to interaction; establish problem solving groups which cut across administrative, instructional staff and student categories.	2	2
			3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		

Goal Statement Nos.	Response Sheet Nos.		Scale A	Scale B
			33	34
17.	33/34.	To insure that decisions are influenced by individuals who are responsible for their implementation.	0 1 2	0 1 2
		e.g. Establish decision making procedures which actively involve the instructional staff, students and administrators.	3 4	3 4
		Comments:		
			35	36
18.	35/36.	To establish cooperative efforts among the instructional staff of the school; i.e., collective planning, implementation and evaluation.	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
		e.g. Organizing decision-making bodies such as academic senates, curriculum counsels, and multi-discipline teaching teams.	4	4
		Comments:		
			37	38
19.	37/38.	To insure an equitable exchange of expected services and benefits between the organization and and its members.	0 1 2	0 1 2
		e.g. Survey school personnel to determine if teachers are doing what they anticipated when they were hired, and if they are being rewarded by the institution as they expected.	3 4	3 4
		Comments:		
			39	40
20.	39/40.	To adopt a formal organization which is consistent with staff perceptions of leadership.	0 1	0 1
		e.g. Selecting indiviuals for positions of leadership based on criteria developed by those directly affected by the choice.	2 3 4	2 3 4
		Comments:		

Goal Statement Nos.	Response Sheet Nos.		Scale A	Scale B
			41	42
21.	41/42.	To establish a means for disseminating information concerning the project to other non-project schools in the system.	0 1 2	0 1 2
		e.g. Establishing a teacher exchange system where project and non-project teachers will exchange jobs for a period of time.	3 4	3 4
		Comments:		
		Goals Related to Professionalism		
			43	44
22.	43/44.	An increased commitment to have the school staff maintain a professional role.	0 1	0 1
		e.g. Formal review by the instructional staff of all school procedured and regulations in terms of a Professional Code of Ethics which encourages the staff to perform in a manner they assess to be more professional.	2 3 4	2 3 4
		Comments:		
			45	46
23.	45/46.	To increase the professional commitment of the instructional staff to the public trust.	0 1	0 1
		e.g. Encourage teachers to act as champions of sound community policy; counterparts to a public and special interest groups which are sometimes shortsighted in their educational views.	2 3 4	2 3 4
		Comments:		
			47	48
24.	47/48.	To gradually transfer credentialing authority to the professional teachers' organization.	0 1	0 1
		e.g. Recommend that the State Department of Education allow the professional organization to assume credentialing authority.	2 3 4	2 3 4
		Comments:		

Goals Related to Evaluation

Goal Statement Nos.	Response Sheet Nos.		Scale A	Scale B
			49	50
25.	49/50.	To assess the project's progress effectiveness on a continuous basis.	0	0
			1	1
		e.g. Training personnel in the organization informative evaluation.	2	2
			3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		
			51	52
26.	51/52.	To establish an accountability system through which the institution can account for costs in terms of instructional effectiveness and efficiency to its several publics.	0	0
			1	1
			2	2
			3	3
		e.g. Establish a program planning system which ties budgeting directly to educational outcomes.	4	4
		Comments:		
			53	54
27.	53/54.	To develop a comprehensive system for periodic goal analysis, planning, development, and evaluation of the instructional program.	0	0
			1	1
			2	2
		e.g. Explore the potential of a system's self-renewal process model with the assistance of a qualified evaluation specialist.	3	3
			4	4
		Comments:		

Part II. List below any goals which were not covered in items 1 - 54.